

COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO PROGRAM VIABILITY FORM INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

The Program Viability process serves as the mechanism for the assessment of programs that have been identified as "at risk." Program Viability is a component of campus planning that leads to increased quality of instruction and service and to better use of existing resources. The process is an extension of Program Review and is intended to be a positive look at an at-risk program. Quantitative and qualitative data are used to review a program's academic health and ensure that the program reflects the College mission and accomplishes college, division, and program goals. Program Viability review may result in a recommendation to improve a program through minor programmatic changes, to improve a program through major programmatic changes, or to discontinue the program.

Name of Program: Building Inspection

Division(s): Business/Technology

Program Viability Committee members: Christopher Walker, Arielle Smith, Jesenia Diaz, Christy Baird, Lee Miller

Start Date for Review: Fall 2022

- I. **DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM** (Data resources: CSM Course Catalogue; department records; Program Review, Strategic Plan; Educational Master Plan; ISLOs; program degree and certificate SLOs; discussions with faculty, students, and community; District sources; additional sources deemed appropriate by review committee)

From the 2021-22 Program Review:

"CSM's Building Inspection programs plays a vital role CSM's Business & Technology Division. This program offers students a selection of certifications and degrees that prepare students for careers as Building Inspectors for both private and public sector employers. Students learn essential, current information about local and municipal building codes in courses that span electrical, plumbing, structural, ADA and energy and sustainability applications. Building Inspection courses are taught by experienced, real-world building inspectors who combine classroom instruction with their real-life experiences. Students who complete a CSM building inspection certificate will be able to enter this career path with a solid, well-informed foundation."

- II. **QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS AND ANALYSIS** (Data resources: Educational Master Plan; Core Program and Student Success Indicators; additional data provided by Office of Planning, Research and Institutional Effectiveness; previous Program Review and Planning reports; other department records; assessment of student learning outcomes; additional sources deemed appropriate by review committee)

- Building Inspection Certification Analysis (9/27/2022)
- Building Inspection Occupation Deep Dive (9/27/2022)
- Program Overview – Building Inspection (April 2023)
- 2021-22 Building Inspection Program Review
- Student Success and Core Program Indicators – Academic Years 2018/19 to 2020/21

- a. Evaluate the quantitative sources with respect to enrollment, retention, and student success, including student learning outcomes. —Identify trends; determine and evaluate the (anticipated) effect of any recent or planned programmatic changes. Briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs relative to current, past, and projected program and college student success rates. Identify and discuss any unmet student needs.

- Consistent offering of 3-4 courses per semester (6-7 per AY)
- Consistently high success (86%+) and retention rates (95%+)
- The courses are being scheduled appropriately to meet the student needs. Students are able to complete the program in a timely fashion. Also, students often return for additional courses periodically to update and maintain knowledge for their employment.

b. Analyze the productivity of this program in terms of its target load. Identify trends; determine and evaluate the (anticipated) effect of any recent or planned programmatic changes. Discuss the number of full-time and adjunct faculty, overload and reassigned FTEF, and the effect of these factors on the efficiency of the program.

- There are currently 4 adjunct faculty and 0 full-time faculty. Some of the adjuncts only teach Fall or Spring (but not both).
- Load ranging from 366 to 485 indicates acceptable efficiency for offered courses
- FTEF of 0.6-0.7 per semester. Not enough for a full-time professor (thus the all-adjunct department). Current instructors in this discipline do not meet minimum quals for other disciplines.
- Each course requires an instructor with a particular specialty. One instructor could not teach all the courses needed; therefore, replacing the adjunct faculty with one full-time faculty would not be feasible.

c. Does the program address students' needs with respect to equity in terms of diversity, age, and gender? Evaluate the impact of programmatic changes or other measures that have been implemented in order to improve student success or address unmet needs with respect to equity.

- Program enrollment matches the ethnic diversity of the college, but skews more male than overall enrollment. Program did address this gender gap in the 2021-22 program review, and has seen an increased percentage of female students in recent years.
- If the program didn't exist, many of the students enrolled in the program might not attend CSM at all.

III. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS AND DISCUSSION (*Data resources: OPRIE reports, Program Viability Committee research, open forums, additional sources deemed appropriate by review committee.*)

a. Describe qualitative information obtained through surveys, campus and community forums, focus groups or other means. Discuss how this information should be used in conjunction with the quantitative data in the previous section to provide a complete picture of the program.

During a focus group with the current faculty

- 75% of current inspectors on the Peninsula came from the CSM program
- Moving the program to community education would likely eliminate the viability of the program due to higher cost to students and lower pay for faculty.
- In response to low program completion rates, faculty redesigned the program to cycle through all courses.
- There has been difficulty recruiting new adjunct faculty in recent years.
- Recruitment of faculty and students was previously organized by the dean. These efforts need to be re-invigorated by the faculty.

IV. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

- a. Describe how the program has fulfilled administrative requirement like program review, curriculum updates, student recruitment, community/employer outreach, advisory committee, and other required activities.

- Program review has been completed when required. A full-time faculty in another department assisted.
- As a CTE program, courses must be updated every 2 years. Most courses in the program have only been updated on 3-5 year intervals.
- State building codes are typically updated every 3 years. This mismatch in timing is the root cause of the delay in curriculum updates.
- The vocational education advisory committee (advisory board) for this program is currently not in compliance with State regulations. The committee currently only consists of program faculty. State regulations require participation from outside experts in the field.

V. SUMMARY OF DATA

- a. Summarize the data and cite internal and external factors that clearly show the program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

Program Strengths

- Program Diversity
- Good Completion Rates
- Good Success Rates
- Good Employment Prospects

Program Weaknesses

- Adjunct only program
- Failure to consistently complete administrative tasks on schedule
- Poor communication between faculty and division dean

Program Opportunities

- Continue to increase female enrollment
- Include more community involvement in advisory committee
- Increase degree completion by students, not just single course completion
- Keeping course material up-to-date with changing building codes

Program Threats

- Difficulty recruiting new faculty as current faculty retire

VI. RECOMMENDATION

- a. Overall recommendation and rationale.

Summarize the committee’s recommendation (minor programmatic change, major programmatic change, or discontinuance) and the rationale for this recommendation.

Based on the above data and analysis, The committee is only recommending minor programmatic changes. The program itself has maintained reasonable enrollment numbers, and there is still employment demand for the courses.

Also, the committee was presented with the idea of moving the program to community education. We are strongly recommending against this idea. This would hurt the recruitment of students (higher cost to students) and the recruitment of faculty to teach in the program (lower pay to faculty). The benefits of the program to the community and to the students would diminish and it would likely become nonviable.

b. Recommended programmatic changes.

If programmatic changes are recommended by the committee, describe the proposed changes and discuss the rationale for each. (Note: If the committee recommends discontinuance, this section and sections c. and d. may be left blank. However, the committee may wish to provide recommendations for improvement to be used in the event that the committee’s recommendation for discontinuance is not accepted.)

For the program itself, the committee makes the following recommendations for improvement:

1. Identification of a faculty lead for the program. The program is currently comprised of only adjunct faculty, so this faculty lead will need to be compensated for non-teaching duties. This person will also need to be compensated for any necessary training for these duties.
2. Restructuring of the program’s vocational education advisory committee (advisory board) to bring it into compliance with Title 5 section §55601.
3. Update of courses that are currently past the 2-year review requirement. Commitment from faculty to keep curriculum updated on the required 2-year cycle.
4. Improvement in communication with staff and administrators.

In review of this program, the committee would like to make some general recommendations to the college related to all adjunct-only programs across the campus.

1. Standardizing and documenting the non-instructional work that instructors need to do in adjunct-only programs.
2. Clear, college-wide guidelines compensating adjuncts for administrative work.
3. Targeted training and support for adjuncts in completing non-instructional tasks. Support could come from the Dean, staff members, or full-time faculty in other related departments.
4. Consider hiring a staff member tasked with supporting adjuncts in completing the administrative responsibilities of these programs.
5. Improving communication between the Division office and adjunct faculty (especially in adjunct-only programs).

c. Recommended Resources.

List the resources required to implement recommended programmatic changes, including faculty positions, classified positions, instructional equipment, instructional materials, and other requests.

Resources Requested	Rationale and Expected Outcome if Granted	Expected Impact if Not Granted
N/A	N/A	N/A

- d. Provide a plan and schedule for the assessment of recommended programmatic changes. Assessment should be completed within one year.

The program should be assessed for progress in December (at the end of the Fall Semester) and in May (end of the Spring Semester). Success will be measured as follows:

1. Completion of curriculum updates for courses out of compliance.
2. Plan of action for regular maintenance of curriculum.
3. Minutes from regular advisory board meetings, which should have a committee makeup in compliance with Title 5.

VII. IMPLICATIONS OF DISCONTINUANCE

- a. If discontinuance is recommended by the committee, discuss the implications for students, faculty, staff, the College, the District and the community. (Note: If the committee recommends that the program is to be improved, this section may be left blank. However, the committee may wish to summarize the implications of discontinuing a program so that these may be taken into account as decisions are made.)

N/A

Date of Viability report: _____

Dean's signature

Date